

**Appl. No.** : **09/683,600**  
**Filed** : **January 24, 2002**

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

The indication that claim 11 has been withdrawn is noted.

Claims 13-15, 17 and 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly being unpatentable over Perro. In response, each of claims 13, and 24 have been amended to emphasize the patentable distinctions and obviate this interpretation.

Specifically, Perro teaches a system which allows language queries to be sent to a remote device, and used in that remote device for carrying out searches.. For example, a user of Perro's system might say words that are taken as a natural language search. Those words may be voice recognized in the remote device. Based on the voice recognized words, a database, or Web directory, or some other resource accessible by the remote device may be searched. See for example paragraph 45 of Perro. Another embodiment of Perro may use a portable telephone, where the user can speak into the portable telephone, and voice-recognition software 23 on the server interprets the query spoken into the phone, and then carries out the search on the server.

However, the present claims are directed to a wholly different concept, that is itself unobvious based on the prior art and is based on a problem that was not recognized or evident from the prior art. Specifically, claim 13 recognizes the problem that thin computers may have difficulties in carrying out voice-recognition. For example,

**Appl. No.** : **09/683,600**  
**Filed** : **January 24, 2002**

one may want to carry out a voice-recognition application with a personal digital assistant. However, the PDA device may not have sufficient resources to do the best job at voice recognition. According to claim 13, therefore, the voice-is sent to another computer, the voice is recognized, and the results of that recognition are returned to the original device. Emphasis has been added, since that latter operation is not carried out by Perro.

This is a wholly different than anything suggested by Perro. Perro suggests getting a voice on a device, e.g. a phone (Figure 2), and sending that voice to a remote computer and carrying out voice-recognition on that remote computer. However, Perro also defines using those results on the remote computer, not sending them back to the original computer. In other words, the voice-recognition may be carried out on a server, and then those results are used to search some database on the server. Perro voice recognizes remotely, and then uses the results remotely. Perro does not voice recognize and then send back those results.

Claims like claim 13 are totally different, they recite not only sending the information onto another device for voice-recognition but then, after that, sending back the results from that recognition to the original computer. In this way, the entire voice-recognition is offloaded, even though the same device receives the voice, and then receives the voice-recognition results. This is completely unobvious based on the prior art. The prior art teaches that sending the voice for recognition in a computer that will be using that recognized voice. It does not teach sending the voice for recognition in the remote computer and then SENDING BACK THE RESULTS. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests this technique of receiving the voice, recognizing the voice on

**Appl. No.** : **09/683,600**  
**Filed** : **January 24, 2002**

another computer to get recognition results, and then sending those recognition results back to the original device that received the voice. Nothing in the prior art even recognized the problem of difficult voice recognition in a device, that could be remedied by sending the information to another device for recognition. Hence, claim 13 defines a solution to a problem which was never suggested by the prior art: specifically the problem being that the device which receives the voice might not have sufficient processing power to actually process that voice. The claimed sending to another computer for the purpose of voice-recognition is wholly unexpected based on the prior art.

More specifically, claim 13 defines sending information indicative of a voice to be recognized to a second computer and receiving a document that includes recognition results that represent a result of recognizing the voice to be recognized. That document includes recognition information.

Perro simply teaches recognizing the voice on another computer, and then doing a search of a database or some other resource using that recognized voice. It does not suggest returning a document that includes recognition information that represents the voice to be recognized from the second computer. Nothing teaches sending the voice to be recognized, and then receiving those results back. No one recognized the problem noted above that is solved by the presently system, and hence this claimed combination is wholly unobvious.

Claim 13 should therefore be allowable along with the claims that depend therefrom.

**Appl. No.** : **09/683,600**  
**Filed** : **January 24, 2002**

Claim 17 is amended to recite that the recognition results are displayed on the first computer and includes words that represent the spoken voice. This is further distinct from the prior art that does not display such information, does not return words that represent the spoken voice, as claimed.

Claim 24 has been amended in a similar way, to recite that the process information includes document information that is representative of the voice-recognition information and that the voice-recognition information is in a form that can be displayed as words that represent the voice data. Such is in no way taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Claim 25 (which was rejected as being obvious over Perro) depends from claim 24 and should be allowable for analogous reasons to those discussed above. In addition, however, claim 25 defines that the connection capability, that connects to send the voice data to be recognized, is a Bluetooth part. While the prior art does teach use of Bluetooth for communication, it does not teach or suggest or motivate a person having ordinary skill in the art to use of Bluetooth part for the purpose of sending information to be recognized, as claimed.

Claim 18 was rejected over Perro in view of Edson. This claim should be allowable by virtue of its dependency for reasons discussed above.

Claims 19-23 stand rejected over Edson in view of Perro. Claim 19 has been amended in an analogous way to recite that the recognition information is returned in a document that represents the spoken voice. As described above, nothing in the cited prior art teaches or suggests returning the recognition results to the original device that received and sent the voice in the first place.

**Appl. No.** : **09/683,600**  
**Filed** : **January 24, 2002**

The primary reference to Edson does show a computer with a remote electronic device. However, Perro is still presented to show the claimed recognition. As described above, the recognition done by Perro is wholly different than the claimed recognition, since the claim requires that the recognition results are sent back.

Claim 19 should hence be allowable along with the claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 26 is also presented here when it in order to provide further distinguishing features as discussed above, specifically that words representing the recognized information is displayed. This is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art..

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

**Appl. No.** : **09/683,600**  
**Filed** : **January 24, 2002**

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address scott@harrises.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1387(small entity).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_ October 26,2007

\_\_\_/Scott C Harris/\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott C. Harris  
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844  
Scott C. Harris, Esq.  
P.O. Box 927649  
San Diego, CA 92192  
Telephone: (619) 823-7778  
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717